

Proof of a conjecture on isolation of graphs dominated by a vertex

Peter Borg

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, University of Malta, Malta
 peter.borg@um.edu.mt

Abstract

A copy of a graph F is called an F -copy. For any graph G , the F -isolation number of G , denoted by $\iota(G, F)$, is the size of a smallest subset D of the vertex set of G such that the closed neighbourhood $N[D]$ of D in G intersects the vertex sets of the F -copies contained by G (equivalently, $G - N[D]$ contains no F -copy). Thus, $\iota(G, K_1)$ is the domination number $\gamma(G)$ of G , and $\iota(G, K_2)$ is the vertex-edge domination number of G . We prove that if F is a k -edge graph, $\gamma(F) = 1$ (that is, F has a vertex that is adjacent to all the other vertices of F), and G is a connected m -edge graph, then $\iota(G, F) \leq \lfloor \frac{m+1}{k+2} \rfloor$ unless G is an F -copy or F is a 3-path and G is a 6-cycle. This was recently posed as a conjecture by Zhang and Wu, who settled the case where F is a star. The result for the case where F is a clique had been obtained by Fenech, Kaemawichanurat and the present author. The bound is attainable for any $m \geq 0$ unless $1 \leq m = k \leq 2$. New ideas, including divisibility considerations, are introduced in the proof of the conjecture.

1 Introduction

Unless stated otherwise, we use capital letters such as X to denote sets or graphs, and small letters such as x to denote non-negative integers or elements of a set. The set of positive integers is denoted by \mathbb{N} . For $n \geq 1$, $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ (that is, $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : i \leq n\}$). We take $[0]$ to be the empty set \emptyset . Arbitrary sets are taken to be finite. For a non-empty set X , the set of 2-element subsets of X is denoted by $\binom{X}{2}$ (that is, $\binom{X}{2} = \{\{x, y\} : x, y \in X, x \neq y\}$). For standard terminology in graph theory, we refer the reader to [29]. Most of the terminology used here is defined in [1].

Every graph G is taken to be *simple*, that is, its vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$ satisfy $E(G) \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$. We may represent an edge $\{v, w\}$ by vw . We call G an n -vertex graph if $|V(G)| = n$. We call G an m -edge graph if $|E(G)| = m$. For $v \in V(G)$, $N_G(v)$ denotes the set of neighbours of v in G , $N_G[v]$ denotes the closed neighbourhood $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ of v , and $d_G(v)$ denotes the degree $|N_G(v)|$ of v . For $X \subseteq V(G)$, $N_G[X]$ denotes the closed neighbourhood $\bigcup_{v \in X} N_G[v]$ of X , $G[X]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by X , and $G - X$ denotes the graph obtained by deleting the vertices in X from

G . Thus, $G[X] = (X, E(G) \cap \binom{X}{2})$ and $G - X = G[V(G) \setminus X]$. Where no confusion arises, the subscript G may be omitted; for example, $N_G(v)$ may be abbreviated to $N(v)$. With a slight abuse of notation, for $Y \subseteq E(G)$, $G - Y$ denotes the graph obtained by removing the edges in Y from G , that is, $G - Y = (V(G), E(G) \setminus Y)$. For $x \in V(G) \cup E(G)$, we may abbreviate $G - \{x\}$ to $G - x$.

A *component* of G is a maximal connected subgraph of G . Clearly, the components of G are pairwise vertex-disjoint, and their union is G .

Consider two graphs G and H . If G is a copy of H , then we write $G \simeq H$ and we say that G is an *H-copy*. If H is a subgraph of G , then we say that G *contains* H .

For $n \geq 1$, the graphs $([n], \binom{[n]}{2})$, $([n], \{\{1, i\} : i \in [n] \setminus \{1\}\})$ and $([n], \{\{i, i+1\} : i \in [n-1]\})$ are denoted by K_n , $K_{1,n-1}$ and P_n , respectively. For $n \geq 3$, C_n denotes the graph $([n], \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \dots, \{n-1, n\}, \{n, 1\}\})$. A K_n -copy is called an *n-clique* or a *complete graph*, a $K_{1,n}$ -copy is called a *star*, a P_n -copy is called an *n-path* or simply a path, and a C_n -copy is called an *n-cycle* or simply a cycle.

If $D \subseteq V(G) = N[D]$, then D is called a *dominating set* of G . The size of a smallest dominating set of G is called the *domination number* of G and is denoted by $\gamma(G)$. If \mathcal{F} is a set of graphs and F is a copy of a graph in \mathcal{F} , then we call F an *\mathcal{F} -graph*. If $D \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - N[D]$ contains no \mathcal{F} -graphs, then D is called an *\mathcal{F} -isolating set* of G . Note that D is an \mathcal{F} -isolating set of G if and only if $N[D]$ intersects the vertex sets of the \mathcal{F} -graphs contained by G . Let $\iota(G, \mathcal{F})$ denote the size of a smallest \mathcal{F} -isolating set of G . If $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$, then we may replace \mathcal{F} in these defined terms and notation by F . Clearly, D is a K_1 -isolating set of G if and only if D is a dominating set of G . Thus, $\gamma(G) = \iota(G, K_1)$.

The study of isolating sets was introduced by Caro and Hansberg [14]. It is a natural generalization of the study of dominating sets [12, 13, 17–20]. One of the earliest results in this field is the bound $n/2$ of Ore [26] on the domination number of any connected n -vertex graph $G \not\simeq K_1$ (see [17]). While deleting the closed neighbourhood of a dominating set yields the graph with no vertices, deleting the closed neighbourhood of a K_2 -isolating set yields a graph with no edges. In the literature, a K_2 -isolating set is also called a *vertex-edge dominating set*. Consider any connected n -vertex graph G . Caro and Hansberg [14] proved that $\iota(G, K_2) \leq n/3$ unless $G \simeq K_2$ or $G \simeq C_5$. This was independently proved by Żyliński [31] and solved a problem in [8] (see also [9, 22]). Let \mathcal{C} be the set of cycles. Solving one of the problems posed by Caro and Hansberg [14], the present author [1] proved that

$$\iota(G, \mathcal{C}) \leq \frac{n}{4} \tag{1}$$

unless $G \simeq K_3$, and that the bound is sharp. A special case of this result is that $\iota(G, K_3) \leq \frac{n}{4}$ unless $G \simeq K_3$. Solving another problem posed in [14], Fenech, Kae-mawichanurat and the present author [4] proved that

$$\iota(G, K_k) \leq \frac{n}{k+1} \tag{2}$$

unless $G \simeq K_k$ or $k = 2$ and $G \simeq C_5$, and that the bound is sharp. The result of Ore and the result of Caro and Hansberg and of Żyliński are the cases $k = 1$ and $k = 2$, respectively. In [14], it was also shown that $\iota(G, K_{1,k}) \leq \frac{n}{k+1}$. For $k \geq 1$, let

$\mathcal{F}_{0,k} = \{K_{1,k}\}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{1,k}$ be the set of regular graphs of degree at least $k - 1$, let $\mathcal{F}_{2,k}$ be the set of graphs whose chromatic number is at least k , and let $\mathcal{F}_{3,k} = \mathcal{F}_{0,k} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1,k} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,k}$ (see [2, 3]). In [2], the present author proved that for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$,

$$\iota(G, \mathcal{F}_{i,k}) \leq \frac{n}{k+1} \quad (3)$$

unless $G \simeq K_k$ or $k = 2$ and $G \simeq C_5$, and that if $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then the bound is sharp. This generalizes all the results above as $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{1,3}$ and $K_k \in \mathcal{F}_{1,k} \cap \mathcal{F}_{2,k}$. It is worth mentioning that domination and isolation have been particularly investigated for maximal outerplanar graphs [6, 7, 10, 11, 14–16, 21, 23–25, 27, 28], mostly due to connections with Chvátal’s Art Gallery Theorem [11].

Consider any connected m -edge graph G . Fenech, Kaemawichanurat and the present author [5] also proved that, analogously to (2),

$$\iota(G, K_k) \leq \frac{m+1}{\binom{k}{2} + 2} \quad (4)$$

unless $G \simeq K_k$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{1,k}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{2,k}$ be as above, and let $\mathcal{F}_{3,k}$ now be $\mathcal{F}_{1,k} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,k}$. Recently, the present author [3] proved that, analogously to (3), for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,

$$\iota(G, \mathcal{F}_{i,k}) \leq \frac{m+1}{\binom{k}{2} + 2} \quad (5)$$

unless $G \simeq K_k$, and that the bound is sharp. This generalizes (4) and immediately yields $\iota(G, \mathcal{C}) \leq \frac{m+1}{5}$ if $G \not\simeq K_3$. In this paper, we prove a conjecture of Zhang and Wu [30] that generalizes (4) in another direction. Before presenting the result, we construct a graph that attains the conjectured bound. The following is a generalization of [5, Construction 1.2] and a slight variation of the construction of $B_{n,F}$ in [1].

Construction 1 Consider any $m, k \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ and any connected k -edge graph F , where $F \simeq K_1$ if $k = 0$ (that is, $V(F) \neq \emptyset$). By the division algorithm, there exist $q, r \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ such that $m + 1 = q(k + 2) + r$ and $0 \leq r \leq k + 1$. Let $Q_{m,k}$ be a set of size q . If $q \geq 1$, then let v_1, \dots, v_q be the elements of $Q_{m,k}$, let F_1, \dots, F_q be copies of F such that the $q + 1$ sets $V(F_1), \dots, V(F_q)$ and $Q_{m,k}$ are pairwise disjoint, and for each $i \in [q]$, let $w_i \in V(F_i)$, and let G_i be the graph with $V(G_i) = \{v_i\} \cup V(F_i)$ and $E(G_i) = \{v_i w_i\} \cup E(F_i)$. If either $q = 0$, T is the null graph (\emptyset, \emptyset) , and G is a connected m -edge graph T' , or $q \geq 1$, T is a tree with vertex set $Q_{m,k}$ (so $|E(T)| = q - 1$), T' is a connected r -edge graph with $V(T') \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^q V(G_i) = \{v_q\}$, and G is a graph with $V(G) = V(T') \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^q V(G_i)$ and $E(G) = E(T) \cup E(T') \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^q E(G_i)$, then we say that G is an (m, F) -special graph with quotient graph T and remainder graph T' , and for each $i \in [q]$, we call G_i an F -constituent of G , and we call v_i the F -connection of G_i in G . We say that an (m, F) -special graph is *pure* if its remainder graph has no edges ([5, Figure 1] is an illustration of a pure $(71, K_5)$ -special graph). Clearly, an (m, F) -special graph is a connected m -edge graph.

If F and G are graphs such that either $G \simeq F$ or $F \simeq K_{1,2} (\simeq P_3)$ and $G \simeq C_6$, then we say that (G, F) is *special*. In the next section, we prove the following result.

Theorem 1 *If F is a k -edge graph with $\gamma(F) = 1$, G is a connected m -edge graph, and (G, F) is not special, then*

$$\iota(G, F) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{m+1}{k+2} \right\rfloor.$$

Moreover, equality holds if G is an (m, F) -special graph.

This proves Conjecture 4.4 of the recent paper [30], in which Zhang and Wu treated the case where F is a star. Note that $\gamma(F) = 1$ means that F has a vertex v that is adjacent to all the other vertices of F , that is, $V(F) = N[v]$. Also note that the bound in Theorem 1 is attained for any $m \geq 0$ unless $1 \leq m = k \leq 2$. This follows by the second part of the theorem because clearly it is only when $1 \leq m = k \leq 2$ that every (m, F) -special graph G is such that (G, F) is special. Note that the bound is attained if $m = 0$ and $G = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.

New ideas, including divisibility considerations, are introduced in the proof of Theorem 1 out of necessity. They are mostly concentrated in the argument for Case 1.2 of the proof.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

We start the proof of Theorem 1 with two lemmas from [1].

Lemma 1 ([1]) *If G is a graph, \mathcal{F} is a set of graphs, $X \subseteq V(G)$, and $Y \subseteq N[X]$, then $\iota(G, \mathcal{F}) \leq |X| + \iota(G - Y, \mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Let D be an \mathcal{F} -isolating set of $G - Y$ of size $\iota(G - Y, \mathcal{F})$. Clearly, $V(F) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ for each \mathcal{F} -graph F that is a subgraph of G and not a subgraph of $G - Y$. Since $Y \subseteq N[X]$, $X \cup D$ is an \mathcal{F} -isolating set of G . The result follows. \square

Lemma 2 ([1]) *If G_1, \dots, G_r are the distinct components of a graph G , and \mathcal{F} is a set of graphs, then $\iota(G, \mathcal{F}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \iota(G_i, \mathcal{F})$.*

For a vertex v of a graph G , let $E_G(v)$ denote the set $\{vw : w \in N_G(v)\}$. For $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$, let $E_G(X, Y)$ denote the set $\{xy \in E(G) : x \in X, y \in Y\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first prove the second part of the theorem. Thus, suppose that G is an (m, F) -special graph with exactly q F -constituents as in Construction 1, and that (G, F) is not special. Then, $|E(G)| = m$ and $q = \left\lfloor \frac{m+1}{k+2} \right\rfloor$. If $q = 0$, then $m \leq k$, and hence, since $G \not\cong F$, $\iota(G, F) = 0 = q$. Suppose $q \geq 1$. Then, $\{v_1, \dots, v_q\}$ is an F -isolating set of G , so $\iota(G, F) \leq q$. If D is an F -isolating set of G , then, since $G_1 - v_1, \dots, G_q - v_q$ are copies of F , $D \cap V(G_i) \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in [q]$. Therefore, $\iota(G, F) = q$.

Using induction on n , we now prove that the bound in the theorem holds. Thus, let G be a connected m -edge graph such that (G, F) is not special. Since $\iota(G, F)$ is an integer, it suffices to prove that $\iota(G, F) \leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}$. If k is 0 or 1, then $F \simeq K_1$ or $F \simeq K_2$, and hence the result is given by (4). Suppose $k \geq 2$. Let $n = |V(G)|$ and $\ell = |V(F)|$.

Since $k \geq 2$, $\ell \geq 3$. Let \mathcal{S} be the set of F -copies contained by G . If $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$, then $\iota(G, F) = 0 \leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}$. Suppose $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\iota(G, F) \geq 1$ and $n \geq \ell$. Since $\gamma(F) = 1$, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, $V(S) = N_S[v_S]$ for some $v_S \in V(S)$. Let $U = \{u \in V(G) : V(S) = N_S[u] \text{ for some } S \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Let $v \in U$ such that $d_G(u) \leq d_G(v)$ for each $u \in U$. For some $F_1 \in \mathcal{S}$, $V(F_1) = N_{F_1}[v] \subseteq N_G[v]$. Thus, $d(v) \geq \ell - 1 \geq 2$. Since G is connected and contains F_1 , and (G, F) is not special (so $G \neq F_1$), $m \geq |E(F_1)| + 1 = k + 1$. If $V(G) = N[v]$, then $\iota(G, F) = 1 \leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}$. Suppose $V(G) \neq N[v]$. Let $G' = G - N[v]$ and $n' = |V(G')|$. Then, $V(G') \neq \emptyset$.

Let \mathcal{H} be the set of components of G' . For any $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $x \in N(v)$ such that $x y_{x,H} \in E(G)$ for some $y_{x,H} \in V(H)$, we say that H is *linked to* x and that x is *linked to* H . Since G is connected, for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $x_H y_H \in E(G)$ for some $x_H \in N(v)$ and some $y_H \in V(H)$. We have

$$E(F_1) \subseteq E(G[N[v]]), \quad \{x_H y_H : H \in \mathcal{H}\} \subseteq E_G(N(v), V(G')), \quad (6)$$

$$m \geq |E(G[N[v]])| + |E_G(N(v), V(G'))| + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |E(H)| \geq k + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |E(H) \cup \{x_H y_H\}|. \quad (7)$$

Let $\mathcal{H}' = \{H \in \mathcal{H} : (H, F) \text{ is special}\}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\iota(H, F) \leq \frac{|E(H)|+1}{k+2}$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{H}' = \emptyset$. By Lemma 1 (with $X = \{v\}$ and $Y = N[v]$) and Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(G, F) &\leq 1 + \iota(G', F) = 1 + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \iota(H, F) \\ &\leq \frac{k+2}{k+2} + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{|E(H)|+1}{k+2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Thus, if $m \geq k + 1 + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} (|E(H)| + 1)$, then $\iota(G, F) \leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}$. Suppose $m < k + 1 + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} (|E(H)| + 1)$. Then, by (7), $m = k + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} (|E(H)| + 1)$ and

$$E(G) = E(F_1) \cup \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} (E(H) \cup \{x_H y_H\}). \quad (9)$$

We have $(k+2)\iota(H, F) \leq |E(H)| + 1$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Case 1.1: $(k+2)\iota(I, F) \leq |E(I)|$ for some $I \in \mathcal{H}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} m + 1 &\geq k + 2 + (k+2)\iota(I, F) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{I\}} (k+2)\iota(H, F) \\ &= (k+2) \left(1 + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \iota(H, F) \right) \geq (k+2)\iota(G, F) \quad (\text{by (8)}), \end{aligned}$$

so $\iota(G, F) \leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}$.

Case 1.2: $(k+2)\iota(H, F) = |E(H)| + 1$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Here we introduce the idea of considering $I - y_I$ for some member I of $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'$ (which, in this case, is \mathcal{H} as we are in Case 1), and the idea of considering $G - (\{v\} \cup V(I))$ and $G - V(I)$. Let

$I' = I - y_I$. Let \mathcal{J} be the set of components of I' . Since I is connected, for each $J \in \mathcal{J}$, $y_I z_J \in E(G)$ for some $z_J \in V(J)$. Let $\mathcal{J}' = \{J \in \mathcal{J} : (J, F) \text{ is special}\}$. For each $J \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{J}'$, let D_J be an F -isolating set of J of size $\iota(J, F)$. By the induction hypothesis, $|D_J| \leq \frac{|E(J) \cup \{y_I z_J\}|}{k+2}$ for each $J \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{J}'$.

Suppose $\mathcal{J}' = \emptyset$. Let $G'' = G - (\{v\} \cup V(I))$. Let L_1, \dots, L_s be the distinct components of G'' . Consider any $i \in [s]$. By (9), there exist some $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $A_i \subseteq E(F_1) \setminus E_G(v)$ (each of \mathcal{H}_i and A_i is possibly empty) such that

$$E(L_i) = A_i \cup \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} (E(H) \cup \{x_H y_H\}).$$

Thus,

$$|E(L_i)| = |A_i| + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} (|E(H)| + 1) = |A_i| + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} (k+2)\iota(H, F). \quad (10)$$

We now introduce divisibility considerations. Since $A_i \subseteq E(F_1) \setminus E_G(v)$ and $d(v) \geq 2$, $|A_i| \leq k - d(v) \leq k - 2$. Thus, by (10), (L_i, F) is not special (otherwise, $|E(L_i)| = k$ or $(k, |E(L_i)|) = (2, 6)$). By the induction hypothesis,

$$\iota(L_i, F) \leq \frac{|E(L_i)| + 1}{k+2} = \frac{|A_i| + 1}{k+2} + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} \iota(H, F) \leq \frac{k-1}{k+2} + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} \iota(H, F).$$

Since $\iota(L_i, F)$ is an integer, we obtain $\iota(L_i, F) \leq \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} \iota(H, F)$. Now, clearly, $\bigcup_{i=1}^s \mathcal{H}_i = \mathcal{H} \setminus \{I\}$ (and $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_s$ are pairwise disjoint), so we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \iota(L_i, F) \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} \iota(H, F) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{I\}} \iota(H, F) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{I\}} \frac{|E(H) \cup \{x_H y_H\}|}{k+2}.$$

By (9), the components of $G - \{v, y_I\}$ are L_1, \dots, L_s and the members of \mathcal{J} . Since $v, y_I \in N[x_I]$, Lemmas 1 and 2 give us

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(G, F) &\leq 1 + \iota(G - \{v, y_I\}) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^s \iota(L_i, F) + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \iota(J, F) \\ &\leq \frac{|E(F_1) \cup \{x_I y_I\}| + 1}{k+2} + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{I\}} \frac{|E(H) \cup \{x_H y_H\}|}{k+2} + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{|E(J) \cup \{y_I z_J\}|}{k+2} \\ &\leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose $\mathcal{J}' \neq \emptyset$. If $J \in \mathcal{J}'$ and $J \simeq F$, then let $D_J = \emptyset$. If $J \in \mathcal{J}'$ and $J \simeq C_6$ (so $F \simeq K_{1,2}$), then let z'_J be the vertex of J such that $V(J) = N_J[\{z_J, z'_J\}]$, and let $D_J = \{z'_J\}$. Let $G^* = G - V(I)$. Then, G^* is connected and contains F_1 . Suppose $G^* \simeq C_6$. Then, $E(G^*) = \{vw_1, w_1w_2, w_2w_3, w_3w_4, w_4w_5, w_5v\}$ for some distinct $w_1, \dots, w_5 \in V(G) \setminus \{v\}$. Let $H^* = (\{w_2, w_3, w_4\}, \{w_2w_3, w_3w_4\})$. Since $V(F_1) \subseteq N[v]$, (9) gives us that $V(F_1) = N[v] = \{v, w_1, w_5\}$, $H^* \in \mathcal{H}$, and H^* is linked to x_{H^*} only, which contradicts $w_1w_2, w_4w_5 \in E(G^*)$. Thus, $G^* \not\simeq C_6$. If $\mathcal{H} = \{I\}$, then $G^* = F_1$ and we let $D = \emptyset$. If $\mathcal{H} \neq \{I\}$, then $G^* \neq F_1$ and we let D be an F -isolating set of G^* of size

$\iota(G^*, F)$. By the induction hypothesis, $|D| \leq \frac{|E(G^*)|+1}{k+2}$. Clearly, $D \cup \{y_I\} \cup \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} D_J$ is an F -isolating set of G , so

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(G, F) &\leq |D| + 1 + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}'} |D_J| + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{J}'} |D_J| \\ &\leq \frac{|E(G^*)| + 1}{k + 2} + \frac{|\{x_I y_I\} \cup \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}'} (E(J) \cup \{y_I z_J\})|}{k + 2} + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{J}'} \frac{|E(J) \cup \{y_I z_J\}|}{k + 2} \\ &\leq \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\mathcal{H}' \neq \emptyset$. For each $x \in N(v)$, let $\mathcal{H}'_x = \{H \in \mathcal{H}' : H \text{ is linked to } x\}$ and $\mathcal{H}^*_x = \{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}' : H \text{ is linked to } x \text{ only}\}$. For each $H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'$, let D_H be an F -isolating set of H of size $\iota(H, F)$.

Suppose $H \simeq C_6$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}'$. Then, $F \simeq K_{1,2}$ and $H = (\{y_1, \dots, y_6\}, \{y_1 y_2, \dots, y_5 y_6, y_6 y_1\})$ for some distinct $y_1, \dots, y_6 \in V(G)$ with $y_1 = y_H$. Let $G^* = G - N_H[y_4]$ and $A^* = \{y_2 y_3, y_3 y_4, y_4 y_5, y_5 y_6\}$. Then, G^* is connected and $A^* \subseteq E(G) \setminus E(G^*)$. We have $x_H, y_2, y_6 \in N_{G^*}(y_1)$, so $y_1 \in U$ (as $F \simeq K_{1,2}$), and hence $d_G(v) \geq d_G(y_1) \geq 3$. Thus, since $d_{G^*}(v) = d_G(v)$, G^* is neither a copy of F nor a 6-cycle. Let D^* be a smallest F -isolating set of G^* . By the induction hypothesis, $|D^*| \leq \frac{|E(G^*)|+1}{k+2} = \frac{|E(G^*)|+1}{4}$. By Lemma 1 (with $X = \{y_4\}$ and $Y = N_H[y_4]$),

$$\iota(G, F) \leq 1 + |D^*| \leq \frac{|E(G^*)| + 5}{4} = \frac{|E(G^*)| + |A^*| + 1}{k + 2} \leq \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}.$$

Now suppose $H \not\cong C_6$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}'$. Then, each member of \mathcal{H}' is a copy of F .

Case 2.1: $|\mathcal{H}'_x| \geq 2$ for some $x \in N(v)$. Let $X = \{x_H : H \in \mathcal{H}' \setminus \mathcal{H}'_x\}$. We have $x \notin X \subset N(v)$, so $d(v) \geq 1 + |X|$. Let $D = \{v, x\} \cup X \cup \left(\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'} D_H\right)$. We have $V(G) = N[v] \cup \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} V(H)$, $y_{x,H} \in N[x]$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}'_x$, and $y_{x_H,H} \in N[x_H]$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}' \setminus \mathcal{H}'_x$, so D is an F -isolating set of G . Since $\iota(G, F) \leq |D|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} m + 1 &\geq 1 + d(v) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}'_x} |E(H) \cup \{x y_{x,H}\}| + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'_x} |E(H) \cup \{x_H y_H\}| \\ &\geq 2 + |X| + (k + 1)|\mathcal{H}'_x| + (k + 1)|\mathcal{H}' \setminus \mathcal{H}'_x| + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'} (k + 2)|D_H| \\ &\geq 2 + |X| + 2(k + 1) + (k + 1)|X| + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}'} (k + 2)|D_H| = (k + 2)|D|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\iota(G, F) \leq \frac{m+1}{k+2}.$$

Case 2.2:

$$|\mathcal{H}'_x| \leq 1 \text{ for each } x \in N(v). \quad (11)$$

Let $H \in \mathcal{H}'$. Let $x = x_H$ and $y = y_H$.

Case 2.2.1: H is linked to x only. Let $X = \{x\} \cup V(H)$. Then, $G - X$ has a component G^*_v such that $N[v] \setminus \{x\} \subseteq V(G^*_v)$, and the other components of $G - X$

are the members of \mathcal{H}_x^* . Let D^* be an F -isolating set of G_v^* of size $\iota(G_v^*, F)$, and let $D = \{x\} \cup D^* \cup \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} D_I$. Then, D is an F -isolating set of G . Since

$$E(G) \supseteq \{vx, xy\} \cup E(H) \cup E(G_v^*) \cup \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} (E(I) \cup \{x_I y_I\}),$$

$$m + 1 \geq 3 + k + |E(G_v^*)| + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} (|E(I)| + 1) \geq 3 + k + |E(G_v^*)| + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} (k + 2)|D_I|. \quad (12)$$

Suppose that (G_v^*, F) is not special. By the induction hypothesis, $|D^*| \leq \frac{|E(G_v^*)| + 1}{k + 2}$. By (12),

$$m + 1 \geq 3 + k + (k + 2)|D^*| - 1 + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} (k + 2)|D_I| = (k + 2)|D| \geq (k + 2)\iota(G, F),$$

so $\iota(G, F) \leq \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}$.

Now suppose that (G_v^*, F) is special. Suppose first that $G_v^* \simeq F$. Then, $\{x\} \cup \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} D_I$ is an F -isolating set of G , and hence $\iota(G, F) \leq 1 + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} |D_I|$. By (12),

$$m + 1 \geq 3 + 2k + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} (k + 2)|D_I| > (k + 2)\iota(G, F),$$

so $\iota(G, F) < \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}$. Now suppose $G_v^* \not\simeq F$. Then, $F \simeq K_{1,2}$ and $G_v^* \simeq C_6$. Thus, $G_v^* = (\{v, x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2, w_3\}, \{vx_1, x_1 w_1, w_1 w_2, w_2 w_3, w_3 x_2, x_2 v\})$, where $\{x_1, x_2\} = N(v) \setminus \{x\}$ and w_1, w_2, w_3 are the distinct elements of $V(G) \setminus (N[v] \cup X \cup \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} V(I))$. Since $\{x, w_2\} \cup \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} D_I$ is an F -isolating set of G , $\iota(G, F) \leq 2 + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} |D_I|$. By (12), $m + 1 \geq 9 + k + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}_x^*} (k + 2)|D_I|$. Since $k = 2$, $\iota(G, F) < \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}$.

Case 2.2.2: H is linked to some $x' \in N(v) \setminus \{x\}$. Then, $x'y' \in E(G)$ for some $y' \in V(H)$. Let $I = G - V(H)$. Then, I is connected. Since $H \simeq F$, $V(H) \subseteq N[w]$ for some $w \in V(H)$. Let $A = E_G(N(v), V(H))$. Then, $xy, x'y' \in A$.

Suppose that (I, F) is not special. By Lemma 1 (with $X = \{w\}$ and $Y = V(H)$) and the induction hypothesis,

$$\iota(G, F) \leq 1 + \iota(I, F) \leq \frac{|E(H) \cup A|}{k + 2} + \frac{|E(I)| + 1}{k + 2} \leq \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}.$$

Now suppose that (I, F) is special. Suppose $I \simeq C_6$. Then, $F \simeq K_{1,2}$. Thus, $k = 2$, $F_1 \simeq K_{1,2}$ and $H \simeq K_{1,2}$. Since $V(F_1) \subseteq N[v]$, it follows that $N(v) = \{x, x'\}$ and $E(I) = \{vx, xz_1, z_1 z_2, z_2 z_3, z_3 x', x'v\}$ with $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\} = V(I) \setminus N[v]$. Since $F \simeq K_{1,2}$ and $v, z_1, y \in N(x)$, we have $x \in U$ and $d(x) \geq 3 > d(v)$, contradicting the choice of v . Therefore, $I \not\simeq C_6$. Thus, $I \simeq F$, and hence $I = F_1$. We have $E(G) = E(H) \cup E(I) \cup A$ and $V(H) \cap V(I) = \emptyset$, so

$$m = |E(H)| + |E(I)| + |A| = 2k + |A|.$$

Since $V(F_1) \subseteq N[v]$ and $V(H) \subseteq N[w]$, we have $V(G) = N[\{v, w\}]$, so $\iota(G, F) \leq 2 = \frac{m - |A| + 4}{k + 2}$. Thus, if $|A| \geq 3$, then $\iota(G, F) \leq \frac{m + 1}{k + 2}$. Suppose $|A| \leq 2$. Since $xy, x'y' \in A$, $A = \{xy, x'y'\}$.

Suppose $w \in \{y, y'\}$. Then, $|N(w) \cap \{x, x'\}| \geq 1$. Since $V(H) \subseteq N[w]$, we have $|V(G - N[w])| \leq |V(I)| - 1 = \ell - 1$, so $\iota(G, F) = 1 < \frac{m+1}{k+2}$.

Now suppose $w \notin \{y, y'\}$. We may assume that

$$d_H(y) \leq d_H(y'). \quad (13)$$

Let $J = G - N[x']$. Let $J_H = J[V(J) \cap V(H)]$ and $J_I = J[V(J) \cap V(I)]$. We have $y' \in V(H) \setminus V(J_H)$, $v, x' \in V(I) \setminus V(J_I)$ and

$$E(J) \subseteq E(J_H) \cup E(J_I) \cup \{xy\}. \quad (14)$$

Suppose that J contains an F -copy F_2 . Then, $V(F_2) \subseteq N_J[u]$ for some $u \in V(F_2)$. Since $|V(J_H)| \leq \ell - 1$ and $|V(J_I)| \leq \ell - 2$, it follows by (14) that $u = y$ and $V(F_2) = \{x\} \cup V(H - y')$. By (14), $N_{F_2}(x) = \{u\}$. Thus, since $H \simeq F \simeq F_2$, $d_H(z) = 1$ for some $z \in V(H)$. Since $d_H(w) = \ell - 1 \geq 2$, $z \neq w$. Since $V(H) \subseteq N[w]$, $N_H(z) = \{w\}$. Since $\{x\} \cup V(H - y') = V(F_2) \subseteq N_J[u] = N_J[y] \subseteq \{x\} \cup N_H[y]$, we have $V(H - y') \subseteq N_H[y]$, so $z \in \{y, y'\}$ (otherwise, we obtain $w, y \in N_H(z)$, a contradiction). If $z = y$, then $N_H(y) = \{w\}$. If $z = y'$, then $d_H(y) \leq 1$ by (13), so again $N_H(y) = \{w\}$. Thus, $V(H) = \{w, y, y'\}$. Since $I \simeq F \simeq H$, $V(I) = \{v, x, x'\}$. Since $x \in V(J)$, we have $xx' \notin E(G)$, so $E(I) = \{vx, vx'\}$. Thus, $F \simeq K_{1,2}$. Since $H \simeq F$, $E(H) = \{wy, wy'\}$. Thus, we have $E(G) = \{vx, xy, yw, wy', y'x', x'v\}$, meaning that $G \simeq C_6$, which is a contradiction as (G, F) is not special. \square

References

- [1] P. Borg, Isolation of cycles, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 36 (2020), 631–637.
- [2] P. Borg, Isolation of regular graphs, stars and k -chromatic graphs, arXiv:2303.13709 [math.CO].
- [3] P. Borg, Isolation of regular graphs and k -chromatic graphs, *Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics* 21 (2024), paper number 148.
- [4] P. Borg, K. Fenech and P. Kaemawichanurat, Isolation of k -cliques, *Discrete Mathematics* 343 (2020), paper 111879.
- [5] P. Borg, K. Fenech and P. Kaemawichanurat, Isolation of k -cliques II, *Discrete Mathematics* 345 (2022), paper 112641.
- [6] P. Borg and P. Kaemawichanurat, Partial domination of maximal outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 283 (2020), 306–314.
- [7] P. Borg and P. Kaemawichanurat, Extensions of the Art Gallery Theorem, *Annals of Combinatorics* 27 (2023) 31–50.
- [8] R. Boutrig, M. Chellali, T.W. Haynes and S.T. Hedetniemi, Vertex-edge domination in graphs, *Aequationes Mathematicae* 90 (2016), 355–366.
- [9] G. Boyer and W. Goddard, Disjoint isolating sets and graphs with maximum isolation number, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 356 (2024), 110–116.
- [10] C.N. Campos and Y. Wakabayashi, On dominating sets of maximal outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 161 (2013), 330–335.

- [11] V. Chvátal, A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B* 18 (1975), 39–41.
- [12] E.J. Cockayne, Domination of undirected graphs – A survey, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Volume 642, Springer, 1978, 141–147.
- [13] E.J. Cockayne and S.T. Hedetniemi, Towards a theory of domination in graphs, *Networks* 7 (1977), 247–261.
- [14] Y. Caro and A. Hansberg, Partial domination - the isolation number of a graph, *Filomat* 31:12 (2017), 3925–3944.
- [15] M. Dorfling, J.H. Hattingh and E. Jonck, Total domination in maximal outerplanar graphs II, *Discrete Mathematics* 339 (2016), 1180–1188.
- [16] M. Dorfling, J.H. Hattingh and E. Jonck, Total domination in maximal outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 217 (2017), 506–511.
- [17] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1998.
- [18] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater (Editors), *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1998.
- [19] S.T. Hedetniemi and R.C. Laskar (Editors), Topics on Domination, in: *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 48, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1991, Reprint of *Discrete Mathematics* 86 (1990), no. 1–3.
- [20] S.T. Hedetniemi and R.C. Laskar, Bibliography on domination in graphs and some basic definitions of domination parameters, *Discrete Mathematics* 86 (1990), 257–277.
- [21] M. A. Henning and P. Kaemawichanurat, Semipaired domination in maximal outerplanar graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* 38 (2019), 911–926.
- [22] M. Lemańska, M. Mora and M.J. Souto–Salorio, Graphs with isolation number equal to one third of the order, *Discrete Mathematics* 347 (2024), 113903.
- [23] M. Lemańska, R. Zuazua and P. Żyliński, Total dominating sets in maximal outerplanar graphs, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 33 (2017), 991–998.
- [24] Z. Li, E. Zhu, Z. Shao and J. Xu, On dominating sets of maximal outerplanar and planar graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 198 (2016), 164–169.
- [25] L. R. Matheson and R. E. Tarjan, Dominating sets in planar graphs, *European Journal of Combinatorics* 17 (1996), 565–568.
- [26] O. Ore, *Theory of graphs*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Volume 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1962.
- [27] S. Tokunaga, Dominating sets of maximal outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 161 (2013), 3097–3099.
- [28] S. Tokunaga, T. Jiarasuksakun and P. Kaemawichanurat, Isolation number on maximal outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 267 (2019), 215–218.
- [29] D. B. West, *Introduction to graph theory* (second edition), Prentice Hall, 2001.
- [30] G. Zhang and B. Wu, k -isolation in graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 357 (2024), 99–111.
- [31] P. Żyliński, Vertex-edge domination in graphs, *Aequationes Mathematicae* 93 (2019), 735–742.